

**Remarks**

The paragraph numbers hereafter match Office Action paragraph numbers that they are associated with.

2. As an initial matter Applicant wants to clarify that the Examiner has considered the US patents and English foreign documents listed on the indicated IDSs. The Examiner's statements in paragraph 2 are a bit confusing and seem to indicate that the Examiner has not considered any of the art on the cited IDSs. In addition, Applicant notes that many of the foreign references in the IDSs indicated by the Examiner are in English – Applicant assumes that the Examiner has considered each of these foreign references already.

Applicant checked PAIR and believes that the IDS of December 2, 2004 should have been indicated as December 20, 2004 and has submitted foreign reference abstracts accordingly. If this is in error Applicant requests the Examiner indicate in the next Office Action.

Applicant has resubmitted the non-English prior art along with English translations for the Examiner to review.

3. Applicant has amended each of independent claims 54 and 63 to overcome the 112 issues indicated by the Examiner.

4-5. The Office Action rejected each of claims 1-15, 20, 23-25, 28-35, 37, 41-48, 50-52, 68-83, 85-91, 93-94 and 96-97 as anticipated by Dolin. Applicant has cancelled each of claims 1-53 as well as claims 74-97. Thus, claims rejected as anticipated that are left include claims 68 through 73. Applicant has amended claim 68 to overcome this rejection. To this end, claim 68 now requires that the information

device include a process and that the steps of identifying resources to be positioned within a subspace, identifying the tags associated with the resources and indicating the tags associated with the resources all be performed automatically by the processor.

Dolin teaches that a system user (i.e., a person) manually identifies resources placed or to be placed within subspaces and associated tags and that the user manually indicate the tags by applying them to a hard copy of a facility floor plan (see col. 4, lines 21-41). The new limitations to claim 68 clearly distinguish over Dolin and, for this reason, Applicant requests that the current rejection be withdrawn.

Each of claims 69-73 depends from claim 68 and therefore should be novel over the cited art because of their dependency.

6-10. The Office Action rejected each of claims 16-19, 21-22, 26-27, 36, 38-40, 49, 53, 84, 92 and 95 as obvious over Dolin in view of various references. Applicant has cancelled each of these claims.

11. The Office Action rejected each of claims 54-61, 63 and 65-67 as obvious over Dolin in view of Zagnoni. Applicant traverses this rejection.

Claim 54 requires, among other things, (1) specifying that a first resource communicates with a second resource; (2) identifying the relative juxtapositions of the first and second resources; (3) determining if the first and second resource juxtapositions are consistent with a rule set; and (4) where the juxtapositions are inconsistent, performing a function.

Zagnoni is cited as teaching determining if the position of a second resource is out of position from a first resource and performing a secondary function. Applicant has examined Zagnoni in detail and is clear that the reference fails to teach or suggest first and second components that communicate with each other where the positions between the first and second communicating resources could be inconsistent with a

rule set. To this end, Zagnoni teaches a control system for controlling a motor so that the position of an "effector" can be controlled. Here, the system includes a controller, a motor, an effector, a sensor and some type of a comparator. The controller controls the motor to move the effector in a desired fashion. The sensor senses the position of the effector and provides feedback to the comparator. The comparator compares the position feedback to a desired position of the effector as a function of the motor operation and provides a signal to the controller which is in turn used by the controller to alter control of the motor to bring the motor into a corrected position. Here, as known in the motor control arts, the controller is not communicating with the motor and instead simply changes AC power signals applied thereto to control/alter motor rotor movement. Thus, the motor is not a second resource that the first resource communicates with.

In addition, even if the motor could be considered a second resource that the controller communicates with, the relative position of the motor to the controller is never determined in Zagnoni. In fact, measurement of relative juxtaposition of a controller to a motor is completely irrelevant to how Zagnoni operates. In this regard, a motor controller could be immediately adjacent a motor being controlled or could be two miles away from the motor and could control the motor in a similar fashion from either location. What Zagnoni compares is the position commanded by the controller to the actual position of the effector which has nothing to do with relative juxtaposition of the controller to the motor.

For at least these reasons Applicant believes claim 54 and claims that depend there from are non-obvious over the art cited and requests that the current rejection be withdrawn.

Each of claims 55-61 depends from claim 54 and should be non-obvious over the cited art for the reasons articulated above with respect to claim 54.

Each of independent claims 63 and 65 includes limitations that are similar to the limitations described above with respect to claim 54 and therefore Applicant believes each of claims 63 and 65 is non-obvious over the cited references and requests that the

current rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 66 and 67 depend from claim 65 and therefore each of these claims should be non-obvious over the cited art for the reasons articulated above with respect to claim 54.

12. The Office Action rejected each of claims 62 and 64 as obvious over Dolin in view of Metcalf. Claims 62 and 64 depend from claims 54 and 63 which are non-obvious over the cited for the reasons discussed above and, through their dependency, should likewise be non-obvious.


Applicant believes the amended claims recites patentable subject matter and allowance of the same is requested. No fee in addition to the fees already authorized in this and accompanying documentation is believed to be required to enter this amendment, however, if an additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 17-0055 in the amount of the fee.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID W. FARCHMIN

Date: 3-9-09

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael A. Jaskolski  
Reg. No. 37,551  
Attorney for Applicant  
QUARLES & BRADY, LLP  
411 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee, WI. 53202-4497  
(414) 277-5711